

From: Laija, Emerald
To: ["Thorne, Brian"](#)
Subject: FW: debrief of Meeting with Lockheed
Date: Monday, April 01, 2013 3:12:00 PM

Brian,

I forwarded an email I sent to Fredrick (see below). It is my expectation that Lockheed will send CERCLA-related documents with EPA and then I would share those with DEQ. I'm concerned that if you send things directly to DEQ on CERCLA-related work that it will encourage DEQ to provide comments directly to Lockheed. I'm trying to avoid Lockheed getting double sets of regulator comments on the CERCLA side. Let me know if this causes any problems.

Thanks,
Emy

Emerald Laija, Environmental Scientist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(509) 376-4919 | laija.emerald@epa.gov
Hanford Project Office | 309 Bradley Blvd, Suite 115 | Richland, WA 99352

From: Laija, Emerald
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2013 3:04 PM
To: MOORE.Fredrick@deq.state.or.us
Subject: RE: debrief of Meeting with Lockheed

Fredrick,

I'm not sure what the communication plan suggests as far as getting items out to each agency since that plan has not yet been finalized. My main concern with Brian sending you things directly is that it may result in increased miscommunication between DEQ, EPA, and Lockheed. Until we have a better handle on how the agencies want to communicate, I prefer to remain as the main point of contact for the CERCLA-related work. Forwarding documents allows me to stay informed of what is happening with the project and helps me to lay out the path forward for each item. It also helps me manage expectations. For example, I expect any comments DEQ has on the draft SAP would be sent to EPA as EPA is the lead on that work. It would be confusing for Lockheed if they received EPA comments and DEQ comments separately.

I can't speak for how items are shared related to the RCRA permit, but I believe the communications plan should help lay that out.

Let me know if we need to chat more about this.

Thanks,
Emy

Emerald Laija, Environmental Scientist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(509) 376-4919 | laija.emerald@epa.gov
Hanford Project Office | 309 Bradley Blvd, Suite 115 | Richland, WA 99352

From: MOORE Fredrick [<mailto:MOORE.Fredrick@deq.state.or.us>]
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2013 11:13 AM
To: Laija, Emerald
Subject: RE: debrief of Meeting with Lockheed

Hi Emy, I can report that I got my draft response to the 5-Year Review Report late last week and today it only has to go through Sheila's and Lissa's review. It's gone through Bruce Gilles review so my prediction is that finalizing the letter will go quickly.

It is an option that it sounds like Brian will forward me the things he will submit to Region 10, so I think you won't have to forward things to me (though double-checking with me to see if I got something would not be a bad idea).

A meeting in mid-May sounds fine. Sounds like you're thinking to have it happen in The Dalles. I have not checked others' calendar, but will do so as we get closer.

Cheers, Fredrick

From: Laija, Emerald [<mailto:Laija.Emerald@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2013 11:20 AM
To: MOORE Fredrick
Subject: debrief of Meeting with Lockheed

Fredrick,

As you know, EPA met with Lockheed Martin to discuss the five-year review for the Martin-Marietta Site on March 26. I wanted provide you the highlights of that meeting.

One major change that came from EPA was that in addition to changing the ACLs to MCLs, we plan to put in a recommendation that the PAH levels also be updated. I am working on the language for those additional recommendations and I should have the details out by next week. I'll be sure to email you that information so you can review it. Let me clarify that changing the PAH levels will not require additional digging at the Site. The intention of changing these levels is that in the case of future voluntary cleanups, PAH cleanup levels are clearly identified.

Lockheed is planning on providing written comments on the five-year review by April 1. The draft SAP for air sampling should be provided to EPA by April 5. I'll forward that to you once I receive it. The goal is to be ready to conduct the air sampling around mid-May, so the review periods may need to be short.

Lockheed is working on a technical report on groundwater for the site based on the information available. The report will include recommendations to address data gaps. We are expecting to receive that by April 12. Again, I will forward you the information once I receive the document. I think this report will be a good item for EPA and ODEQ to review and then meet to discuss. **What do you think about having a joint meeting with EPA, ODEQ, and Lockheed in the mid-May timeframe?** We can schedule when the air sampling is taking place and use the technical report on groundwater as a starting point for discussing groundwater on the Site.

Thanks,
Emy

Emerald Laija, Environmental Scientist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(509) 376-4919 | laija.emerald@epa.gov
Hanford Project Office | 309 Bradley Blvd, Suite 115 | Richland, WA 99352